

Special Collections  
Accession No. 04-92  
Box 2

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON  
FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Meeting of 17 May 1993  
(Continued meeting of 3 May, 1993)

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee met at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, 17 May, 1993 in the Forum Room of Parrington Hall. Senate Chair Miceal Vaughan presided.

**PRESENT:** Chair Vaughan, Vice Chair Worthington-Roberts, Secretary of the Faculty Bollard, and President Gerberding; Group Representatives Billingsley, Eberhardt, Kukull, O'Neil, and Slutsky; Faculty Council Chairs Andrews, Dimond, Taricani, and Thouless; Deputy Legislative Representative Zagona; ASUW President Nicastro; GPSS President Turner; regular invited guests Special Assistant to the President Johnson, Special Assistant to the Provost Flores, and CFR Delegate Junker.

**ABSENT:** Group Representatives Bell\*, Blackburn\*, Guntheroth\*, and Sjavik\*; Faculty Council Chairs Benson, Novack\*, Philipsen, Schoenknecht, and Sullivan, Faculty Legislative Representative Spratlen, and Provost Wilkening>(\* excused)

**APPROVAL OF 27 MAY SENATE AGENDA**

Chair Vaughan distributed a draft agenda for the 27 May Faculty Senate meeting and asked for formal approval of the agenda items. In regards to the graduation requirement legislation, Professor O'Neil asked that the results of the vote on the ESR motion taken at the 10 May SEC meeting be clarified. She pointed out that the majority vote did not reflect the votes of the full SEC, only those present; three voted for the ESR motion, the remainder were either against or abstained. She also pointed out that the vote was taken under difficult circumstances: there had been no discussion on this topic during the whole year; the room was hot; and the vote was taken in the presence of a large group of emotionally charged students. An invitation issued by the chair for a motion to reconsider was declined by those present.

Because of serious reservations about individual parts of the graduation requirement issue, Chair Vaughan asked if the SEC would approve the idea of dividing the motion into six separate parts rather than present the legislation as one package. Thus, one unpopular section would not cause the whole package to fail. A motion was made to present the legislation in six parts but failed because of the lack of a majority. Also, concern was expressed that Professor Benson, chair of the Faculty Council on Academic Standards, was not present to express his opinion about this idea. A motion was passed to distribute the agenda as presented.

**NOMINATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS**

Approval was given for an addition to the original slate of nominees.

**CLASS "A" LEGISLATION: Chapter 28, Adjudication Procedure Revisions:**

Chair Vaughan distributed a memo from the Special Committee on Faculty Women supporting the recommendation that the quantum of proof be specified in the new adjudication policy as the "preponderance of the evidence"; copies of lists prepared by Chair Vaughan summarizing adjudication issues under the headings of four levels of agreement among SEC members; and a summary of the types of adjudication cases that have been handled since 1985.

There was a discussion regarding how to present the adjudication legislation to the Faculty Senate. A motion was made by Professor Eberhardt to present the latest adjudication document as prepared with comments by the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs. Concern was expressed that the legislation might fail if it was presented to the Senate without addressing the areas of disagreement expressed by SEC members. Chair Vaughan responded that he felt it was important at this point, to hear the views of the Senate regarding this legislation. If the proposal passed the first reading, the SEC would discuss it further next fall; if it failed, it would be possible for the SEC to revive it next year. Professor Andrews said that the Faculty Council on Faculty Affairs presented the best document it could to the SEC, and he would like it to be forwarded to the Senate as is; however, that could be risky. There is still substantial disagreement on several key issues in the document. Professor Andrews felt that, unless the SEC takes ownership of the

